Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1

August 16, 2012

Attendees: see sign-in sheet

Meeting called to order at 1:04pm.

David Nguyen made some opening comments, and introduced his team. TAC members then introduced themselves.

Tony Barth and Jason Lynch presented a project overview, including the scope of the study, planned schedule, previous studies, and TAC objectives.

- Chris Hiebert Added an update to long-range plans reaffirming plan: Review Update and Affirmation
- David Nguyen We will add to future presentations
- Brian DNR Waukesha asked about level of involvement of TAC before final EIS.
- Bethaney We will be meeting with smaller groups before then to work on specific issues throughout the project.
- Jason The schedule highlights major milestones and activities.
- David We could certainly add another TAC meeting in a good suggestion.
- Brian Can we clarify what the role of the group is? What is the exact purpose of this group?
- Jason It is literally technical advising. The WisDOT project team will work on geometric
 issues, traffic analysis, environmental, etc. and will present these to the TAC for their input
 and comments. The key stakeholders will also be sought for perspectives regarding
 screening alternatives before the PIMs. We are looking for feedback and offering a snapshot
 to TAC as to the progress, as the study moves forward.
- Brad Heimlich clarified the TAC's purpose: essentially the purpose of TAC meetings is to open a pathway for dialog utilizing your technical perspectives on the project. Your experiences represent a variety of different sources. We are soliciting your help on alternatives, seeking your advice and counsel. WisDOT and FHWA will make final decisions, but upfront work will be done to feed that deliberation and decision-making process. Dialog will be open and established as a two-way street from early on. Equally important, TAC will serve as conduits to community to pass on project and contact information. Asked Beth how many are on the newsletter mailing list currently?
- Beth There are currently 7,000 on newsletter mailing list representing a variety of areas and diverse populations but we are anticipating adding many more.
- David We will be meeting as a group 4 or 5 more times, more if TAC feels we need to share more communication.
- Brad We will be flexible and open to dialog as needed.

Brad Heimlich discussed some of the existing features, deficiencies, and elements of the existing freeway and interchanges.

- Mike What always struck me were the crest vertical curves. I would go over a crest and suddenly encounter brake lights.
- Brad That is a great observation and will be considered. There are a lot of geometric
 deficiencies that need to be addressed along the corridor.
- Chris There would have to be an acceptance of design exceptions should a "replace-in-kind" option be implemented.

Brad introduced some of the different alternative concepts.

Following the presentation, the meeting moved to an "open floor", questions-and-discussion format:

- Chris What does braiding mean?
- Brad Explained that off/on -ramps could be braided which would separate traffic (grade separations, or bridges, between on- and off-ramps that overlap).
- Mike Duckett Miller Park and surrounding lots and circulation roads is a major "challenge/opportunity"
 - When designed in late 90's, the primary challenge was that the Brewers made it clear that transportation had to be improved from before that time. Their measure was that they were planning 12,800 parking spots and shuttles planning for 30,000+ visitors per game. Unloading is an issue. Brewers target getting attendees off-property within 45 minutes of the end of a game. The Brewers feel that is accomplished, except during rush hours. The Brewers track the origin of visitors; currently, about 56% of fans attend from outside of the 5-county region, most/all of whom will use freeways. The Brewers can provide traffic (origin-destination) information that may help the study team by providing arrival/departure patterns.
- David We were planning on asking for that and thanks for volunteering. If parking is impacted, we will figure out a replacement.
- Bethaney Is there flexibility in format of parking surface vs. garage?
- Mike It can take too long to leave structures, and then parkers are still stuck in traffic.
 Perhaps dedicated ramps for events only, and/or skywalks could be considered.
- David Recognize that access during games is critical.
- Mike Unloading is the primary issue.
- Peter (for Mike Thompson) He already shared his "laundry list" before the meeting. The biggest of which is water quality; the existing transmission lanes are also a priority.
- Mike Could replace-in-kind receive federal funding?
- Bethaney potentially, yes.
- Will Safety is still a primary concern.
- An ATC representative pointed out that a substation is missing a label (Park Hill). There is also one missing farther east near the canal. There are four substations along the corridor (approximately at 27th, 33rd, 40th, and 68th). If one or more needs to be moved, it gets

expensive very quickly. Plus, if they are moved during baseball season it will affect stadium operations. How do we serve community while we are in the process of replacing/moving them?

- David What are their ages and how often do they need to be replaced? Does ATC have a ten-year (or equivalent) capital improvement plan for tower maintenance and/or replacement?
- Answer: ATC does it on an as-needed basis, no long-range plan for maintenance. Major new facilities require coordination with the PSC. Likely would replace old structures in their current location.
- Barbara We look at expanding when replacing, not moving; relocation near heavily urban area is very complicated.
- David asked if Chris had concerns or comments.
- Chris You are offering variety of alternatives.
- Debra/Brian Water quantity is our primary concern. Storm water management is a challenge because of detention issues. Properties built along the freeway didn't used to flood, but now they do because of imperviousness. We've spent millions plus predictions show there will be more runoff in the future due to development changes and increases. Encourages the study team to look at infrastructure to deal with water quantity so it doesn't impact taxpayers. Regarding water quality: the biggest impact on water quality is from streets and roads, which falls onto DOT and municipalities. Look at opportunities to improve water quality which improves quality of life in general. Lots of entities can help, but WisDOT has the opportunity to make a huge impact with this project.
- Brian The DNR is concerned about level of TMDL and other water quality-related sediment and contaminant reductions – the quality affected by run-off.
- Mike Duckett When Miller Park was built, DOT rebuilt 41 South/Miller Parkway and made tremendous improvements.
 - Mike Maierle initial thoughts are that it is easy to say what you can and can't do but they all involve some very difficult tradeoffs. Many businesses want access, but right-of-way impacts will result, with abutting landowners affected. Can't say that we should improve things without impacting anything because that is unrealistic. Also, former Mayor Norquist used to say that in cities, things are closer together. That's efficient from a transportation perspective. We do have choices in the city regarding transportation. In the urban area, we do have alternatives to driving on the freeway. People will find other routes like they did during repaving. In Waukesha, development seems to be focused on freeways, so there is more local use of interstate. Local trips can be kept at a minimum here.
- Mike Duckett For Brewers games, mass transit arrivals make up less than 1% of total entries to a game. Thirty-nine companies provide shuttle service to games. Brewers have struggled in trying to address and accommodate this traffic, and look at ways of improving usage. Could this study investigate mass transit in and out of ballpark? Could we utilize this project to help with this?
- David suggested possible increased use of frequent flyer bus routes on I-94.

- Mike Yes like buses or dedicated ramps. Parking is also expensive. Now would be a good time to review this.
- David That is a good question we will add this to the list of things to look at.
- West Allis Many local businesses built/developed expecting access at 68th and 70th. It's crucial to keep them. Were these people included in project newsletters and information?
 Like Allis Chalmers business park area. Are only the colored areas getting newsletters?
- Beth We drew a rectangle around the project area and mailed to everyone within that
 area; we put display ads in several newspapers (Journal/Sentinel, community newspapers,
 Freeman, minority newspapers); intention is to "blanket" PIM information in different
 ways.
- Brad That is exactly why we're here. We can certainly add Allis Chalmers and anyone else who needs to be involved.
- Chris Fornal (City of Milwaukee) We would support alternatives addressing safety issues
 clearly as demonstrated in the past. We don't support loss of residential or business
 properties. There are lots of trade-offs but we want to work with you to address critical
 issues. Degradation of access is a huge concern.
- City has made it clear that we aren't happy with lack of mass modal transportations transit alternatives should be a primary strategy.
- David For local trips, we encourage people to avoid using the freeway and to use local streets. But what gives someone who travels from Waukesha more right to use the freeway than someone who lives locally? Everyone pays for it, so everyone has the right to use the freeway.
- Bill Porter –Since traffic will be rerouted during construction, it's important that
 improvements to local roads be finished prior to construction. We are putting together our
 5-year plan and would like to include any projects of that nature. The sooner we can bring
 up local road use, the better.
- Paul Keltner STOC primary focus is on safety and efficiency. Always easier to build something above standard rather than just below and then be faced with trying to fix it later.
- Scott What is the level of confidence that will be able to meet the range of challenges set forth here?
- Brad as the study progresses, the team and TAC (among others) will monitor these factors.
- Brian Because this involves linking of two projects (Marquette and Zoo Interchanges), physical limits are for study but operational concerns may go beyond that. Hopefully operations will be addressed by proposals from Marquette through the Zoo.
- Brad We will use some of the end-product from Zoo and Marquette traffic modeling for this project.
- David there are a wide range of competing interests and priorities amongst all stakeholders. Please keep that in mind as we're working together throughout the study.

Meeting ended at 2:35pm.





ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1 1-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Thursday, August 16, 2012

Attendee Name	Address	City, State, Zip	Email Address
Bith Pay	1870015685 Kenwood	Menofauls, 53051	both foy & execpe-com
Kathleen' Natson	114 HA Malasson With W. Part PI	Milwankee, 53224	kmatsond harb.com
John Bever	333 W EVEREH	11 53201	john, bever Dwe-evergle
Peter Holtz	POBON 47	Warresha WF 53147	Pholtzeatelle.com
BILL DREVER	4802 SHERCYGAN AVE	MADISW 53707	William drehe co dot, wigov
Keegan Dale	20085 REVERTE CF	Brankfield, US 53045	Keagan do le la ditivi gen
Debra Jensen	260 W See borth ST	milwante wx 5304	d'ensen@mmsdicom
Dobre Payant	WIDOT	Barston Wankeha	
Kunt Farrenking	Kayong & Assoc Inc.	M.IW. W2 53217	Kfagrenkofe Kyaur-assaccom
Tara reulinu	WISDOT VAISTON OFFICE		LOD IM TO B BANING TO THE PAGE
MICHAEL J. MAIERLE	809 N. BROADWAY	milh, 4 I 53202	MICHAEL MATERIE PMILLONKEE.
Brian Bliesner	WISDOT		Drian bliesnano dot. wig
			3





ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Thursday, August 16, 2012

Attendee Name	Address	City, State, Zip	Email Address
Betheney Bridge - Coresoch	EXTUA		Bethaney Bacher-Grown
Marchy James	HNTR		
Scott Lee	WE DOT		Scott leep ROT vi gov
Chris Fornal	(ity of mila.		chris. fornal & milwanker, g





ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Thursday, August 16, 2012

Attendee Name	Address	City, State, Zip	Email Address
Bria Lange	141 NW Barston	Whitesha WI 53188	Bria. Lange a dot wi. a
Jake Livermore	141 NW Barston	Waveesha WI S3211	Jarob. Livermore & dot. wi. god
Bred Hawlich	325 84+St S. H 400	M:10 53214	brod handchechin con
Tray Kaunch	141 NW Barston	Wankesha 53187	tracy. Kaurich @ chzm
BRIAN BLACK		PEN AVICE WI	bblacke atelle con
Barbara Mikolajczyk	ATC		bnikolaj czyk patelle con
Will Anderson	was WISDET DISP BPD		william and esson @ Dot. WI-
JASON LYNCH	141 NW Barstow	Wank, , WI	jason.lynch@dot.wi.gov
Mike Duckett	Miller Park, One Bravers Way	Milyanke, WI 53214	mduckett @ Millerpack district.
BEYAN HARTSOK	141 NW BARSTOWST.	WAYKES 194 W 53188	BRYAN. HARTSOUL DWISCONSING
Tong Boarm	el 1, el	to extra te	Tony Boars & NOT WT. GO.
CHRISTOPHER HICERET	SENTRE		CHIEBERT @ SENETE. ORG
BILL POMER	7725 W. NOMIN DUE	WAUNATUSA, WY. 53212	BPONTER @ WALLETOSA. NET
Peter Doniels	7525 W. Greentield	West AllieuI	polariels enestallisui.
Refer Mimiller	2300 N.D. MLK	mila	person men eller wind

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

December 4, 2012

Attendees: See sign-in sheets Called to order at 9:00 a.m.

David Nguyen thanked everyone for attending and participating, and stressed the importance of the group's continued engagement as the study progresses. TAC members introduced themselves.

Tony Barth explained that TAC Meeting #2 is intended as both a preview of what will be presented to the public at the 2nd public meetings on December 5th and 6th, and as an opportunity for TAC members to review the design options in some detail and ask questions as well as provide any early feedback on pros and cons. He explained that the PIM will be conducted in an open-house format with a looping power-point demonstration available at all times. Study team representatives will be available, and all of the displays shown today will be displayed at both PIM venues (Tommy Thompson Youth Center and Marquette University High School).

Tony then asked if there were any questions regarding the minutes prepared for TAC Meeting #1. There were no questions or comments.

Jason Lynch walked through a number of handouts (see attached):

- Project schedule update
- "Funnel" (screening process)
- "Monopoly board" (NEPA process depiction)
- Summary of PIM #1 Comments
 - ➤ Jeff Polenske asked if some comments, concerns, or preferences were more frequently heard than others, and requested that WisDOT break down comments by the number received (for example, numbers of comments favoring the addition of a 4th lane when compared to those opposing the addition of a 4th lane).
 - o Jason explained that there were a number of comments regarding access and that we are looking for patterns in comments but not quantifying them.
 - Brian Bliesner asked if any measurable public feedback requested that access be removed.
 - Jason said that they received some comments requesting access be closed due to safety.
 - > Tony pointed out that the majority of the comments requested that a specific access point remain, although other points could be closed depending on personal interest or priorities.
- Preliminary data about local traffic and commuter traffic numbers

- Results from an aerial video survey of traffic and travel patterns will be available soon, and will provide additional insight into the traffic information provided by SEWRPC.
- o Both through (commuter) and local (using project-area interchanges) traffic will be quantified and considered as the alternatives development process continues.

Cemetery area challenges

- > Pete asked if any plots were moved the first time they built I-94.
 - Bethaney Bacher-Gresock said approximately 40 had been moved, but now we also need to consider the historic landmark status of the Wood National Cemetery and Soldiers Home complex (there were fewer issues and coordination requirements prior to the passage of NEPA legislation in the late 1960s).
- Jason stated that it is a highly unusual situation to have cemeteries on both sides of an interstate and asked Bethaney if they had discovered any similar situations around the country.
 - Bethaney said that the study team is investigating that issue, and is aware of one project in the Hampton Roads VA area that may have some similarities to this corridor.

Noise Barriers Board

o Jason reviewed the noise barrier board and explained that a WisDOT brochure will be available at PIM #2 explaining how noise barriers work and how/when they are considered as part of the project development process.

Brad explained that the majority of comments received were suggestions to maintain access, although the comments often contradicted which access should stay open. Most of our designs incorporated maintaining access. There are many options that involve access consolidation throughout interchanges. There were many factors considered including safety, geometric issues, cemetery, adjacent residential and commercial property and landowners, and others. He pointed out that WisDOT is still early in the study phase, and that a number of refinements and changes will occur, to these and new design options, based on continuing engineering and traffic studies, and stakeholder feedback. The information presented and reviewed at TAC #3 (and PIM #3) next Spring will look different in some respects, and will include more information on design details and impacts.

- ➤ Bethaney asked if, using the NEPA process, the options can be mixed and matched?
 - Brad said that yes, they can be mixed-and-matched with respect to separate sections of the project, individual interchanges, and access schemes and connections.
- ➤ Tom Pettit explained that the study team has prepared a 3-ring binder with another wide range of initial design options that have already been dismissed from further consideration, based on likely traffic impacts, high construction costs, difficult geometry, and/or other factors. These binders will be available at PIM #2 for attendees to review and provide comments on.

Tom then did a more detailed walk-through of the design options developed by the project team to a greater level of detail, and have remained under consideration as PIM #2 approaches.

Replace in kind

- No graves would be affected.
- Crash rates would be even higher than the current rates, because of increasing traffic volumes and resulting congestion, and continued deterioration of the pavements and bridges.

Spot improvements

- o Include options like collector-distributor (C-D) roads, auxiliary lanes, and other discreet design improvements in specific locations.
- o These are mostly smaller fixes that would be utilized if stakeholders strongly oppose full modernization, if the overall program costs for more substantial alternatives are too large, or other factors. The largest of the spot improvements replaces the Stadium Interchange (including moving left-hand ramps to the right side), but only partially addresses project Purpose and Need objectives, and is a very high-cost stand alone element.

West Leg

- 1st option improves mainline movements by adding a parallel arterial next to the freeway between 70th Street and Hawley Road; this has a lower capacity than some of the other options displayed
- 2nd option includes frontage roads, which will maintain access to existing interchange cross streets, but would force traffic through intermediate intersections to reach some of them
- o 3rd option includes C-D roads, which are higher capacity than frontage roads and separate turning (exiting and entering) traffic from the mainline traffic
- o 4th option reviewed includes ramp braiding. This is the highest capacity solution; it eliminates weaves and congestion between adjacent interchanges
- o Each has a traffic diagram showing what initial analyses indicate are LOS performance levels (A through F); these will likely change as options are optimized, and as sections are mixed and matched across each leg
- He noted that side road traffic hasn't been analyzed yet; intersection layouts and lane arrangements on side streets are subject to change
- > David indicated that all of the options presented today will be placed on WisDOT's project website with an audio clip describing each option
- ➤ Brad said we still don't know the level of service for side roads or arterial road traffic data, so keep in mind that some of these may have more or less lanes depending on final numbers. The options are just a way to show how the different options will work.
- ➤ Mike Duckett/Tom clarified that C-D roads would be free-flow whereas frontage roads would have controlled intersections
- Brad explained that the options often utilized the ATC corridor whenever possible. This has not been truthed with ATC; additional coordination will occur with ATC and We Energies to

- validate these assumptions or require the study team to adjust the options to accommodate utility facilities
- ➤ Pete asked if 55 mph C-D roads were considered.
- > Tom we are looking at C-D road design speeds of 10 mph lower than mainline, with mainline likely at 60 mph
- Tom under each of these options, access would be maintained to and from both Hawley Road and 68th/70th.
- ➤ Bethaney do these use consolidated ramps? Is any access eliminated?
- ➤ Tom all of the options consolidate. This increases capacity and makes things run more smoothly. Depending on feedback and other traffic findings, the possibility exists that some access may still be eliminated completely, however.

Cemetery Area

- Tom reviewed the various options and typical sections through the cemetery area, including both at-grade and double-deck options. Level of service changes (improves or drops) based on the amount of interchange traffic removed from the mainline and moved to the local lanes
- ➤ Will there would also be exceptions to shoulder width on some options which would affect traffic flow in the event of an accident/emergency vehicles/stopped or stalled vehicles
- ➤ Brad We looked at at-grade options that add lanes and/or shoulders. These result in grave relocations; while not presented as "current" options, they are in the 3-ring binder of other options considered. These could be analyzed again down the road but have been removed from consideration for now.

Stadium Interchange

- o Tom reviewed the various major types of interchanges:
- Stacked and turbine
 - Pros Good capacity and flow
 - Cons Large footprint; hard to connect to the rest of the system (long transitions, particularly to the adjacent interchanges on 41/Miller Park Way at Wisconsin/Wells and Canal Street)
- Single point urban interchange (SPUI)
 - Includes embedded access
 - Traffic doesn't flow smoothly on the two-level option, which would implement traffic signals on 41/Miller Park Way. The 3-level SPUI works much better, as through trips in both the east-west and north-south directions are separated from the required signal(s)

Diamond

 Traffic flow doesn't work well (again, signals on 41/Miller Park Way is the primary reason); additional traffic study may offer solutions or refinements to address the congestion Modified echelon (three-level with 41 on one level, turning movements on another level, I-94 on a different level)

East Leg

- o Tom reviewed the range of four options displayed. Before walking through them, he highlighted that impacts on the East Leg are considerable with some options, including residences, business relocations, substations, and a potential major realignment of the freeway. Impacts haven't been quantified yet, but will be as the study continues.
- Braids
 - Expensive, significant footprint
 - Moves well, reduces weave
- Split diamond
 - Reduces weave on mainline, but the combination of traffic to/from both 35th and 27th Street interchanges will likely create congestion on the frontage roads between the two
- o C-D
- Changes alignment, but impacts businesses and residents on south
- Removing the 35th Street interchange
 - Eliminates access, which is a very sensitive topic and would have impacts to homes and businesses and would divert traffic to nearby parallel and intersecting city streets, with impacts to their operations

Brad then opened the floor, indicating that WisDOT wants specific individual feedback from TAC members, but also requests that committee members act as a conduit disseminating information and providing us with feedback the committee receives. It's important to remember and communicate that "increased capacity" can be misconstrued as meaning only the addition of a 4th lane along I-94. There are a number of strategies related to increasing capacity; the better way of describing this objective may be "improved level of service". We have a lot of flexibility in how this objective can be achieved.

Tony made several comments:

- We will be receiving comments at PIM #2 specifically, but WisDOT is always open to receiving feedback, at all times. The study team will be happy to meet with neighborhood groups and other stakeholders, at their request
- The next step is preparation of Section 2 (Alternatives) of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- The next TAC/CAC meetings will be held around May and will include more refinements (relocation information, real estate impacts, and some cost information)
- The full Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be completed in Fall 2013, and the Public Hearing will take place late in the year
- A user survey intended to give the study team insight into users' perspectives on congestion, safety, and other corridor features has been developed and will be available in person at PIMs and online on the website. We would like the committee to help get surveys out.


Concluding Comments, Questions

David stated the following:

- We are requesting comments from the group, either now or by e-mail/phone.
- He asked that everyone remember we are only 25 or 30% into the process.
- This project is for the public. We welcome input and comments and concerns; we seek out and appreciate comments early and often.
- As for impacts, we haven't quantified too many yet. Costs and real estate needs are a significant
 priority, and every attempt will be made to strike the best balance between traffic service,
 improved safety, rebuilt infrastructure, and program costs.

The meeting adjourned 10:30; TAC members and the study team reviewed and discussed the design options and PIM #2 boards in an open-house format until approximately 11:00am.







Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
Will Anderson	WISDET OTSO BPD	(608)46-5663	william anderson to date is in g ou
Jacob Livermore	WISDOT 0750 SE	2112-547-5619	Jarob-Livermore @dot. wz. you
Veegan Delt	W., DOT DISO SE	262-548-8701	ucegan dale @ dot. 4. gov
Jason Lynch	WISDOT DISD SE	414-750-0538	jason lynch Edot wigov
Michael Bischbad	n Wis Dot SE Utilities	262 548-5935	midrael bischbachedot. wigov
Tony BARTH	L' -1 SER	262-148-1822	To-y. So R201 DOT. W. GOV.
My Fully	WISDOT DE	(414)750-0579	Sarateuing & dot.wi.gov
STEUE ST. AMOUN	WE ENERHIES	(414) 221-2401	steve. St-amoure we-enersy a
Tray Kamich	CHIZM HILL	262 470-7252	tracy Kaurich@ DOT.WI GOV
Tom Pettit	CH	262 548 5624	
Wes Shemwell	FHWA	608-347-5025	wesley, shemwell@dot.gov
Peter Donels	Cty west Allie		padanielsa westallisuligas



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study

Tuesday, December 04, 2012



Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
Bestraney Bestrer-Gresock	FHERA-WIDCON SIN	6086622119	Bethaney Bacher-Gresous
FIRE DRONZELL	HILLURULUT CO.	914-278-4952	FORMER & MELL NTEDA
KURT FARRENCUPF	7711 N. PURT WASH RA MILW. WI	414-751-7226	Kterrenky te Kepur-assocou
Brim Back	pensuress, wi	262-506-6907	sslackeatellc.com
DIY PONTER	7775 W. NONTH AND WOUNDAND	414.479-8900	bponter ensure. NE
BRIAN BLIESNER	WISDOT BARSTOW	262 548-6893	brun, bliesner @ widetigov
Jeff Polenske	C:LY MKE	414 286-2400	jefrey. poleske@milwauke
Brd Hamlil	CHIZA HILL	414-807-8246	book. he michech Zu. com



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Tuesday, December 04, 2012



Address	Phone	Email Address
WE ENERGIES	414-221-4278	DAN-SANDED WE-FROKE ICS . CUM
ATC	262-506-6804	bnikolajczyka otelle com
ATC		KStrattonCatcile com
SEWPBPD	414 940 2139	mducket e millerpark district. co
mmsD	4142252143	djensen@mmsdcan
MILL. DCD	414 286-5720	MMATER EMELLALY GE. GOV
WONE	263-8751	peter-minullen wingon
City of Milw.	286-0470	chad Chrisbaum @ milwarts . say
13	286-2452	chris formold milworker.go
	WE ENERGIES ATC ATC SEWPBPD MILL. DCD WDNR City of Milw.	WE ENGLOISE 414-221-4575 ATC 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6804 262-506-6806 414-2252143 MILL. DCD 414-286-5720 WDNR City of Mill. 266-0470

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3

March 20, 2013

Attendees: See sign-in sheets.

Called to order at 1:00 p.m.

David Nguyen thanked everyone for coming and asked for introductions.

Jason Lynch explained purpose of meeting: to update and keep group involved in a group setting. Jason went through the first ten slides.

Brad Heimlich discussed screening recommendations slides.

- West Leg
 - > Chris Hiebert from SEWRPC clarified with Brad how ramp braids work.
- Refinement Process
 - ➤ Jeff Polenske asked if the DOT is looking at how traffic will redirect during construction and the subsequent impacts. He expressed concern about local neighborhoods and also asked that the corridor not be too narrow or many local roads will be impacted.
 - o Brad responded that we will be able to answer those questions after receiving traffic data and that will be a strong consideration.

Question/Answer

- Debra Jensen noted that we are looking at stormwater. She asked if DOT coordinates with the DNR to look at safety and the increased volume of runoff. Debra explained that any increased volume could cause public safety issues and that a lot of work had been done in the Menomonee Valley by Milwaukee and Wauwatosa in regard to flooding. She expressed concern about having I-94 compromise the flood management projects.
 - o Brad said that the EIS does address stormwater quality and quantity
- Debra stated that the peak was being used, not the actual volume. She urged the group to please consider both.
 - Brad explained retention facilities and any other footprint issues will be explored and addressed.
- ➤ Bill Porter asked if the EIS addresses public transportation.
 - o Brad said it does, but only within a specific context. We are looking at what can be done to not preclude transit.
- ➤ Jeff noted that WisDOT should consider this an opportunity. He said that with all of the construction occurring between the Zoo Interchange and I-94 east-west corridor, now would be a good time to develop traffic mitigation measures such as a

Hiawatha extension. He said DOT should address mitigation issues regarding traffic diversion that could help in the long run as well.

- o David told Jeff that DOT is looking at the Hiawatha route effectiveness suggested earlier to see if we could utilize that long-term.
- Sandy Kellner asked if current transit alternatives or possible future transit options were being considered when eliminating options.
 - David explained that there were four things looked at in the Regional Plan: optimized land use; maximizing existing capacity within infrastructure; implementing transit plan provided by SEWRPC, and addressing the residual congestion through selected capacity expansion projects.
 - o Ken Yunker/SEWRPC explained that the traffic forecast used for analysis assumes full implementation of the regional transportation plan. One component is a transit system plan that recommends doubling the current transit service; extension into new areas and expansion of hours; implementing true "express" routes operating on reserved lanes; and preferential signaling for mass transit. The assumption is that this plan is implemented in the forecast provided to WisDOT.
- ➤ Ken clarified that the cemetery options show 4+2 in each direction = 6 total meaning it is a 12-lane section. He asked Brad to explain what "narrow at-grade" means.
 - o Brad explained that there would be 4 lanes in each direction at existing ground level or one more lane added each way to current freeway. He said the 4th lane is necessary to achieve goals, but will result in reduced shoulder widths, and lanes would be reduced below standard size from 12 to 11. He added that Hawley Road and Mitchell Boulevard would also have to be eliminated for that option to work.
- ➤ Ken responded that he sees why lanes and shoulders would be reduced, but wondered if that alternative was being set up to fail by eliminating access. He pointed out that the public has reacted negatively to elimination of access. He questioned the importance of retaining Mitchell Boulevard for the Brewers.
 - Brad agreed that eliminating Hawley Road exit is a huge deal. He explained that there will be ripple effects to expanding to 8 lanes. He said that the possibility of relocating Mitchell is on the table and that working with the public is important so the team can better understand and assess priorities (i.e. safety, performance, access, etc.)
- ➤ Chris Fornal asked if consideration was being given to how the narrow-4-lane atgrade would work in the winter.
 - o Brad said winter had been considered and there would be storage issues and safety concerns.
- ➤ Ken referenced the Turbine option on the Stadium interchange and sought clarification that it would be free flow. He said that essentially now it is free flow but metered, so it isn't actually free flow. He asked if ramp meters would still exist in either interchange option.

- David said this is being discussed internally. He explained that, although there is perception that metering is bad for the system, David sees it as managing the system based on mainline flow. He explained that metering spaces vehicles out 1 or 2 seconds apart and that the interchange wouldn't be metered during non-peak hours, but possibly during peak flow.
- ➤ Mike Maierle pointed out that this has been done in similar cities. He said that a 12-lane freeway is very different from what we are used to and that the impacts might not be as bad as people think. He suggested utilizing graphics and 3D modeling to show people how it will look.
- ➤ Mike Maierle also mentioned that economics and toll roads would be interesting to consider. He said other places have done this and it doesn't cost more, but drivers get where they need to go faster so they're tempted to jump on the freeway for one exit. Ramp metering helps.
 - Brad shared the example of one person at PIM #1 telling him not to get rid of 68th or Hawley because he got on one and off the other every day for work.
- ➤ Jeff asked how the team takes into account on/off traffic that goes on the freeway for short distances, but has extended trips on side-roads. He cautioned the team not to refer to these as local trips just because they get on/off the freeway within the study area.
 - Brad explained that the Skycomp survey looked specifically at vehicles getting on or off. The data can tell if they go left or right after exiting the freeway, but nothing further.
- ➤ Jeff stated that the percentages used may be misrepresenting the short on-off traffic as local traffic rather than extended trips.
 - o Brad explained that the Skycomp survey was taken during AM and PM rush hours, not during off-peak hours or Brewer's games, or an incident occurrence. He said that the 60/40 split seems like an accurate balance.
- > Jeff expressed concern about how people perceive the commuter numbers.
 - o David said that is part of our goal to make people realize it isn't just a commuter route. He said it doesn't matter if a vehicle gets on one exit and exits another right away; that vehicle has the same right to use the freeway as the commuters so it's difficult to choose one group over the other. He explained that they are attempting to address public perception.
 - o Brad requested that Jeff share if/where he sees holes in the logic and they would talk about it.
- ➤ Jeff said that the City of Milwaukee has been consistent with their position since the plan was established. He stated they oppose capacity expansion, access removal, and double-decking because of the impacts. He expressed his concern that the narrow corridor will have dramatic impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.
 - o David addressed capacity expansion. He explained that every project using federal funds needs to meet a particular LOS, C or higher. He acknowledged

that if designed to LOS C or higher, the impacts will be much greater. David said that the team has agreed that designing to LOS C in an urban area could have dramatic impacts, so, with the approval of FHWA, WisDOT is designing for LOS D or better. He explained that they've heard that the public's perception is the project is about adding capacity, but in reality it's about addressing the level of service in 2040. He said the team is trying to address congestion, not just capacity expansion. He stated that access is a tough issue, and that Mitchell Boulevard, for example, is used by many groups, not just the Brewers.

- ➤ Jeff acknowledged that the challenges are endless, but wanted to know what impacts will be to the neighborhoods. He expressed concern that all of the alternatives, no matter what their LOS, would impact the neighborhoods and that's what the City opposes. He said freeway access points have been there for a long time and neighborhoods basically established themselves around that access. He articulated that development will be impacted if access is changed. He said the City is looking out for their interests and representing those who will be impacted. He asked if the 3-D visualization will show what the double-deck will look like from different neighborhoods so they can see how it will impact neighborhoods visually.
 - o David explained that the DOT is obligated to consider double-decking and that it was recommended in SEWRPC plan.
 - o Brad stated that the visualization would be from different angles.
- Chris Hiebert asked if the team has looked at how shadows are thrown based on times of day.
 - o Brad said that wasn't done.
 - o David explained that it was originally designed to be 25-40 feet high.
- ➤ Jim Stenzl asked if mitigation funding is being considered for local arterials.
 - o Brad said the team will be using templates to figure out cost.
- ➤ Ken explained that the double-deck through cemetery area was identified earlier by the DOT and that it is necessary to look at the full range of alternatives and doing the preliminary engineering necessary to eliminate options.
- ➤ Chris Fornal noted that the traffic volume on local streets would decrease when the current LOS F in many places improves to a LOS D. He questioned whether or not consideration was given to the shift from arterials to the freeway.
 - o Brad answered that the forecasting being done by SEWRPC is reflective of what traffic change impacts will be.
- ➤ Mike Thompson asked how the project would affect ATC.
 - Brad said the team is working with ATC and We Energies regularly and asking for their feedback, i.e. what are procedures and logistics involved, steps we need to take, etc. He said that communication will continue as the project moves forward.
- > Pete Holtz said that ATC isn't moving off of the corridor.

- ➤ Barb Mikolajczyk said that, because the project would be related to roadway relocation, a Public Service Commission process isn't required.
- Mike Thompson asked what the public is saying about environmental issues and said that DNR has not heard any concerns about air or water issues.
 - Brad said that the double-deck had raised some questions about air quality, noise, stormwater, snow removal, etc. He said that none stood out more than others, but that stakeholders have expressed concerns.

After receiving no more questions, Jason closed by thanking the group for their time and input.



Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Wednesday, March 20



Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
Tracy Kaurich	CH2 M HILL	414-272-2426	
Brad Heimlich		1	
JASON LYNCH	601500T	414-750 -0538	
Dobia Payat	W.SDOT	(414) 750-2677	
Borbara Mikolajank	ATC	262-506-6804	bmikolajczyk @atc//c.com
Jim Stenzel	west Mila	414 645-6238	James. Stenzel @ west Milwauker.cog
Peter Doniels	City west Allis	4,4302-8374	poloniels a westallisuingos
Debra Joussen	mmsd	4142252143	d rensen@mmid.com
CHRIS HIEBERT	SEXIRPC	262 547 672 1	CHIEBERT @SENEPE.ORG
Mike Brockman	Miller Park (sigma)	414-568-7931	mbrockmane thesignagroup.com
WES SHEMWELL	FHWA	608 347-9025	westy shemwell and gov
Mile Thouse	TNIL	414 303 3408	Marked . Thomps - Wallansnan






Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Wednesday, March 20

Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
Jacob Livermore	141 NW Berstow St, Warkeshn, WZ 82	262-548-5619	Jarob. Livemure adat, wi. g.
Keegn Dole	(1)	262 - 548 - 870]	Weegen dole @ dot. w. ga
Will Anderson	WISDET 4803 She boyen fore madison	608-166-3663	
LEN ROECKER	W.M. IW, VIII & Engineer 1805 W. Bluenover Rd Brookfull WI	262-317-3385	len roce Ker & va smith netions. co
DAVID NEWYEN	141NW BARSTON ST,		devid ugu puedot wi go
Sandy Kellner	1942 N. 17th St. Milw. 53205	4(4 937-3205	skellnere incts.org
10m Winter	1902 N. 171 MYE 53205	ing 437 -300)	
BILL PONTON	7725 W. NONTE DIE	414-672 3933	Drange @ homorais 118
KUNT FARROWER	7711 N. PUZT WASH. RD. MINO. WI 5321	414-757-7226	Kfamenkypfelkypurassoc.com
Petc His 12	Po. Box 47 Warresha WI	262 5066874	2004
CHRISTINE RAWSON	Po. Box 47 Warkester WI	21,2 832 8732	crawson@attche.com
John Bever	333 W EVEREH, Milwaukee WF	414 659 3258	john bever Dave-energies co








Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
BRIAN BLACK	ATC	262-506-6907	bilack catelle .com
Kathleen Malken	HNM	714-897-4627	
Kathlan Malkyn Johnstibal	City of West Allin	414-302-8462	jstibalowistalliswi 900
Jeff Polenske	City of Milwaukee	286-2400	
Joff	West Allis / West Milwa		
Brian			







Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
MICHAEL J. MAJERLE	809 N. Blagomay	414 286.5720	MARTER @MILLARES.OPE
Chris Fornal	841 N. Broadway Rm 920	414.286-2452	cheis . Fornala milwackos.

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4

May 15, 2013

Attendees: See sign-in sheets.

David Nguyen called meeting to order at 10:05. He welcomed everyone and reminded them that the next round of public information meetings (PIMs) are to be held next week. The group introduced themselves.

Tony Barth thanked the group for coming and emphasized the importance of these meetings. He showed a slide presentation about the corridor, its features, project challenges, the project schedule, the EIS status, what will be presented at PIM #4, the importance of public comment and concerns, design modifications made as a result of feedback, and next steps for the project.

Brad Heimlich emphasized that the project remains a work in progress. He presented the range of alternatives that are proposed to remain under consideration and requested feedback on the Department's findings and screening recommendations after the presentation.

Following the presentation, a round-table discussion was initiated.

Comments/Questions from Committee Members

- ➤ Debra Jensen asked if there is a profile available to demonstrate double-decking. She asked about public concerns has the team received height or underground concerns from the public?
 - o David said that noise concerns have been expressed. He referred to the visualizations to see what the double-deck would look like.
 - o Brad said that, from the public's perspective, many would prefer an underground, or "all-down" solution. However, that is a significantly more expensive solution with a number of complications (drainage, ventilation, fire suppression, constructability, etc.)
 - David mentioned that retaining access from an underground solution to an interchange with Hawley Road and the crossing of Mitchell Boulevard (which would need to pass over I-94) would be more difficult.
- > Debra asked what would happen in the vacated areas if the freeway was moved off-alignment.
 - o Brad explained that there are some grading challenges with the existing topography on the east end of the project (north side is high, and south side in the Valley is low), but the Department would investigate those parcels for redevelopment, water quality, or other purposes.
- Mike Duckett asked about C1 (the narrow, 8-lane at-grade typical section through the Cemetery section) and what the reasons are for its screening.
 - o Brad said that the issues include the required elimination of the Hawley Road interchange, reduced lane width (from 12' to 11'), and minimal shoulder widths. He said that the Department has worked hard to find a way to retain the Hawley Road interchange, but ramp proximity to the cemeteries would require grave relocations. In addition, several more homes would be impacted. He explained that crash analysis predicts a 60% increase in post-reconstruction crashes if this narrow typical section is

built, rather than a full-width typical section (at-grade, or via use of a double-deck structure).

- Len Roecker asked if FHWA would even approve the at-grade option.
 - Brad said they have indicated that they would consider it, if it would be in-place for a very short project segment and the impacts resulting from a double-deck solution are significant in comparison.

Visualizations

The group went through all of the visualizations.

- Mike Duckett expressed concern about a signalized intersection on Miller Park Way, on game days, for Alternative S2 (the modified single-point interchange).
 - David said that the team had looked at this and that there are about a dozen weekday games each year that unload Brewer lots at the same time as the afternoon rush hour.
 He said that there are more than a dozen outlets available to exiting traffic, and traffic modeling and simulations will look at traffic operations in this area.
 - David said the team will look at traffic numbers. He explained that the study team will be analyzing freeway and ramp operations based on 12,000 parking stalls and the Brewers' stated goal of 45 minutes to clear the lots.
 - o Marty said that they will analyze how many people are using the freeway and how they would be impacted by the proposed designs. During a night game "spill", 1,200 vehicles can be accommodated, while the demand is around 1,100 vehicles. There is flexibility with the signal design: because cross traffic is limited to two left turns (southbound to eastbound, and northbound to westbound), a two-phase signal with significant greentime preference to those left turns should handle that additional demand.
 - Brad said that getting the I-94 left-turn exit movements (westbound to southbound and eastbound to northbound) out of the signalized intersection significantly simplifies the phasing and increases the intersection's capacity.
- Chris Fornal asked about cost difference between the "all-up" and "all-down" double-deck concepts.
 - o Brad said that the team is looking into construction and long-term (maintenance) cost differences.
- > Chris asked if mitigation costs are considered.
 - o Brad said mitigation costs are considered.
- Debra asked about stormwater handling and mitigation and stated that it would be complex.
 - Brad said a stormwater analysis is underway, and that a lot of good practices and lessons learned would be applied from previous projects, such as the Marquette Interchange.
- Mike Thompson said that from an environmental perspective, there are no significant hazards. He said they are working on air quality concerns, and will also consider stormwater.
- Len Roecker said that the double-deck, based on the visualizations prepared, appears to be "boxed-in" (closed walls), and asked if any of it would be open.

- o Brad said that is one scenario; the team is also looking at openings.
- Tom Pettit said that if, based on construction costs and maintenance issues including ventilation, it can't be closed completely, the section might look something like how the I-43 southbound to I-94 westbound ramps underneath 11th Street within the Marquette Interchange appears today.

Brad asked if there were any more questions, and then invited the group to look at the alternatives and PIM displays. He said the team is available for questions or comments as needed individually.

The meeting was then concluded, and attendees reviewed the displays and discussed them with team members in a one-on-one format.

The meeting concluded at 11:45am.






Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Wednesday, May 15th, 2013

Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
DAVID NEWYEAU	WISDOT	4147501498	Laord. uguyan Odot, w,
JACOB LIVERMOKE	WESDOT		Jacob Livermore adt, ving
Brian Moore	Wis DOT		brian woord @ dot . wi . gov
Jim Stenzel	west mila	414 645-6238	vames. Stenzelewest Milubork
MileThoussen	DNP	414 303 3408	uichada Thompsone Wisconsin.gov
Mike Brockman	MillerPark - Sigma	414-588-7931	abrockmane the sigmagroup can
CHRIS HIEBERT	SENEPC		
Bud Herlich	CHO HU		both heim it echen com
Bon Goldsworths	CHOM HII		bgoldsno Ocham.com
RICH COAKLEY	CHZM HILL	414-847-0423	rookkey e ch2m. com
Tory born	E 207		Tery Papira @ DDT, WI, GOW







Attendee Name	Address	Phone	Email Address
Pete Holtz	ATC PO Box 46 Whikehat	262 506-6874	Pholtzoate Lec. con
Debra Jenson	mmss 260 S Sooboth Milw	4142252143	
Keogan Dole	W:sDot SE Region	262-548-8701	keegen. dole @dot.vi.gov
Dibra Payat		(414) 780-2677	
JASON LYNCH	WISDOT	414-750-0538	jason. lynch @dot. wi.gov
Peter Denals	west Allis	414 302-8374	paniels enestallismi goo
Monty Hawley		414 -331-468	55 mhawleige hntb. con
Kurt Farenkupt	Ropur : ASSOC INC. W. MILW.	414-751-7226	Ktarren Kypte Kapur-assoc.com
LEN ROECKER	RASMITH NATUUR VILLAGE ENG.	. 414-881-036Z	
Liz Schneider	433 EST Paul STE 300	414 225 3728	elizabeth I. Schneider 2 dormi ga
Mike Dukett	Miller Park		mduckette miller park distint
Christina Rawgan	ATC	262 832 8732	crows son@ atcllc.com

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #5

July 29, 2013

Attendees: See sign-in sheets.

Jason Lynch called meeting to order at 1:35. He welcomed everyone and asked for introductions. He went through project background, schedule, and the current status of the study. He explained how the current recommended alternatives were chosen and introduced PIM exhibits. He emphasized the importance of continued public feedback and how the feedback received so far has impacted the decision-making process.

Charlie Webb presented the current recommendations:

West Leg

Keep 68th & 70th, CD-road concept

Cemetery

Double-deck, or

At grade, 8-lane

Stadium

Hybrid of free-flow ramps and signalized; moved south

Mitchell Blvd interchange moved further east

East Leg

Braided ramps, keep interchanges open

Move I-94 south (east of 28th)

Charlie explained that some of the alternatives presented at PIM #3 have been screened from further consideration based on PIM #3 feedback and additional engineering and traffic analysis. In the time since PIM #3, no new alternatives have been introduced. He referred to the PIM # 4 display of the entire corridor and suggested that members take time to look at the board after his presentation.

A&0

- ➤ Debra asked for clarification about the double-deck being all-up or part-down.
 - o Charlie explained that there still needs to be more work done to figure out constructability, ventilation, etc.
 - o Brian Black pointed out that signing and lighting would still be a concern as well.
- > Brian then asked if it would occupy the current footprint.
 - o Charlie said it would use all of the existing highway right-of-way through the cemetery area, and that no new property would be acquired from any of the abutting cemeteries.

Charlie showed renderings of what the double deck would look like.

- > Brian asked if the deck would be completely closed.
 - o Charlie explained that the decision hasn't been made yet. He mentioned that the VA preferred closed, but that having both sides fully enclosed would create some lighting, ventilation, and fire protection challenges regardless of whether the lower level were below the existing freeway elevation or not.

Charlie then introduced the crash prediction data created by the Enhanced Interchange Safety Analysis Tool (ISATe). He explained that this is just one component of how decisions are made.

Tony introduced the "fly-through" video.

Jason explained that the eastbound lanes are on top of the double-deck to accommodate access points and signage.

- Mike asked about Zablocki Drive.
 - o Charlie explained that it is an access point to the VA complex. He said that it couldn't be kept as-is with and "all-up" double-deck option; in that scenario, Zablocki Drive would be moved east, next to Mitchell Boulevard. It would run parallel to Mitchell, but not connect to Mitchell on either side of I-94. He said that VA representatives the team has met with are comfortable with that decision.
- > Jeff Polenske asked why all of the alternatives increase capacity.
 - o Charlie said that LOS D cannot be met with only three lanes, so four lanes is the only way to meet the Purpose and Need.
 - o Jeff stated that the City of Milwaukee's position will not be changing (opposed to expansion of any sort).
- Mark McComb noted that the public asked about transit options and questioned what WisDOT is doing in reaction to public transit concerns.
 - Charlie explained that FHWA and WisDOT develop projects to be consistent with recommendations contained within SEWRPC's Regional Transportation Plan. The SEWRPC plan includes a "Travel Demand Management-Plus" improvement scenario, which includes a doubling of transit service in-place at the time of the plan update, and system recommendations are made to deal with the residual demand and congestion remaining after such an increase in transit. The alternatives don't preclude any elements of plan recommendations. He said that people request why WisDOT doesn't use more money on transit, and explained that WisDOT is not permitted by statute to fund transit-related capital improvements.
- > Brian noted that there are two alternatives for the cemetery section, but only one for the rest. He requested new drawings to reflect the change for utilities.
 - o Jason said that we would continue to work with them and exchange info as needed.
 - o Charlie pointed out that the visualization video will also go online if possible.
- ➤ Jeff asked about transit design, and if WisDOT is planning some sort of transit mitigation within corridor during construction and beyond.
 - Charlie said that it would likely be provided, as this project will follow the precedent established on previous WisDOT freeway projects like the Marquette, Mitchell, and Zoo Interchange projects.

- > Jeff asked if there would be involvement with cities and counties, or if it would be an internal process within WisDOT. He would like to see comprehensive involvement.
 - o Carrie asked if he meant long-term or during construction.
 - o Jeff clarified that he would like to see the investment in construction mitigation approach plan for long-term instead of just during construction.
 - o Charlie said that preliminary design phase would be the time that would be looked at.
 - o Tony said that we have gotten groups together on projects like these and would include transit and cities, counties, etc.
 - Brad explained that newer technologies would allow for long-term mitigation instead of just temporary fixes, citing improvements being implemented along Highway 100 and elsewhere that respond to traffic volume and pattern changes dynamically as they relate to freeway and non-freeway travel patterns.
 - Jason mentioned that, with input from BTO and some other groups, long-term fixes would be explored instead of conventional construction diversion. He said that we are already looking at those issues during the study phase instead of farther along in process.
- ➤ Mark asked if access is combined for Hwy. 41 with 68th/70th access.
 - Charlie said it is.

Charlie invited the group to look around and ask questions of team members as needed.

After a period of one-on-one discussions at the PIM #4 boards, the meeting concluded at 2:50pm.



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #5 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Monday, July 29th, 2013



Attended Meeting	First name	Last name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
	Bethaney	Bacher-Gresock	FHWA	bethaney.bacher-gresock@dot.gov	608-662-2119
Joh Ban	John	Bever	WE Energies	john.bever@we-energies.com	414-659-3258
Brin Blow	Brian	Black	ATC	bblack@atcllc.com	262-506-6907
lot O mil	Pete	Daniels	City of West Allis	pdaniels@westalliswi.gov	414-302-8374
Mila Intillo	Mike	Duckett	Duckett Group, Inc	mduckett@millerparkdistrict.com	414-940-2139
Chris Forme	Chris	Fornal		chris.fornal@milwaukee.gov	414-286-2452
	Chris	Hiebert	SEWRPC	chiebert@sewrpc.org	262-547-6721
	Peter	Holtz	ATC	pholtz@atclic.com	262-506-6874
Jose	Debra	Jensen	MMSD	djensen@mmsd.com	414-225-2143
	Sandy	Kellner	MCTS	skellner@mcts.org	414-937-3205
	Michael	Maierle	City of Milwaukee - DCD	michael.maierle@milwaukee.gov	414-286-5720
	Barbara	Mikolajczyk	ATC	bmikolajczyk@atcllc.com	262-506-6804
CM Colle	Jeff	Polenske	City of Milwaukee	jeffrey.polenske@milwaukee,gov	414-286-2400



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #5 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Monday, July 29th, 2013



Attended Meeting	First name	Last name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
Vill anderson	Will	Anderson	WisDOT	william.anderson@dot.wi.gov	(608) 261-86
	Tony	Barth	WisDOT	tony.barth@dot.wi.gov	
X	Carrie	Cox	WisDOT	carrie.cox@dot.wi.gov	
1	Keegan	Dole	WisDOT	keegan.dole@dot.wi.gov	
	Brian	DuPont	WisDOT	brian.dupont@dot.wi.gov	
	Robert	Elkin	WisDOT	robert.elkin@dot.wi.gov	
	Emlynn	Grisar	WisDOT	emlvnn.grisar@dot.wi.gov	
	Paul	Keltner	WisDOT	paul.keltner@dot.wi.gov	
11/1	Scott	Lee	WisDOT	scott.lee@dot.wi.gov	
Just 7	Livermore	Jake	WisDOT	jacob.livermore@dot.wi.gov	
Lacon Hyul	Jason	Lynch	WisDOT	jason.lvnch@dot.wi.gov	414-750-0538
	Dave	Nguyen	WisDOT	david.nguyen@dot.wi.gov	
	Claudia	Peterson	WisDOT	claudia.peterson@dot.wi.gov	



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #5 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Monday, July 29th, 2013



Attended Meeting	First name	Last name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
	Christine	Rawson	ATC	crawson@atclic.com	262-832-8732
ga Roade	Len	Roecker	West Milwaukee Village	len.roecker@rasmithnational.com	262-317-3383
1/2-	Dan	Sande	We Energies	dan.sande@we-energies.com	414-221-4578
	Mike	Thompson	WDNR	michael.thompson@dnr.state.wi.us	
	Ken	Yunker	SEWRPC	kyunker@sewrpc.org	
	Joe	Ulatowski	HUTE	julitaski@hatb.wa	
Ul Sammell	Wes	Shemwell	FHWA	Wesley, Shemwelle James, Stenzeldwistmit	Pdt-gov
Jam / the	Jan	Steven	West Milw.	James, Stenzelewistmit	970. sustances
Rock Markontok	CARK	WANTOCH		clark-wantock PMILWCA	14111 270 11





Attended Meeting	First name	Last name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
Aziz Aleiow	Aziz	Alein	MC DOT	aziz, aleiow@milwenTx	278-4911
Mark McComb	Marh	McComb	MCTS	MMCCOMBEMCHS. Org	343-1261
Mike Thompson	Mike	Thorpson	DNR	Muhael a Thompson & Wisconsinga	414 303 340
CHEIS GEBERT			SENERC	CHIEBERT DISENETCORY	
43					





Attended Meeting	First name	Last name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
achell	Andy	Rohde	WisDOT	andrew.rohde@dot.wi.gov	288:521443
	Rebecca	Roecker	WisDOT	rebecca.roecker@dot.wi.gov	
	Sheri	Schmit	WisDOT	sheri.schmit@dot.wi.gov	
	Cameron	Smith	WisDOT	cameron.smith@dot.wi.gov	
Kut Samely	Kurt	Farrenkopf	Kapur	kfarrenkopf@kapur-assoc.com	
20	Beth	Foy	Beth Foy	bethfoy@execpc.com	
	Ben	Goldsworthy	CH2M Hill	benjamin.goldsworthy@ch2m.com	
Mydal,	Brad	Heimlich	CH2M Hill	brad.heimlich@ch2m.com	
Tracy Land	Tracy	Kaurich	CH2M Hill	tracy.kaurich@dot.wi.gov	
Samen fulls	Kathleen	Matson	HNTB	kmatson@hntb.com	
, , ,	Tom	Pettit	CH2M Hill	tpettit@ch2m.com	
	Joe	Ulatowski	HNTB	julatowski@hntb.com	
	Charlie	Webb	CH2M Hill	cwebb1@ch2m.com	

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #6

June 5, 2014

Attendees: See sign-in sheets.

Introductions

Mike Treazise called meeting to order at 10:00 AM. He welcomed everyone and introduced himself as the new WisDOT Project Manager. Brad Heimlich then asked everyone to introduce themselves. He gave an outline of what will be discussed and invited the group to ask questions as they arise.

Schedule

He showed the study schedule and said that it has been extended by 12 months in reaction to public feedback and the refinements made to alternatives based upon that feedback. He noted that the Draft EIS will be completed in November and the public hearing is planned for December. The comment period would continue for 45 days. The preferred alternative will be chosen in early 2015. If funding approval is received, construction would take place in 2019.

Meeting Purpose and Need

He explained that the goal is to create alternatives to meet Purpose and Need for the project. He showed a slide demonstrating that, within a 7-county region, 32% of the jobs, 26% of the population, and 41% of businesses are within a 5-mile radius of the Stadium Interchange. Brad then defined VMT (vehicle miles traveled) and showed that driving trends are reduced overall for various reasons including teleworking and economic factors. However, studies have shown that interstate travel has continued to increase at a rate of .5%. Brad said that safety is a huge factor in the decision. He noted that the Marquette Interchange reconstruction has reduced crashes by 48%, and severe (injury and fatality) crashes are down 60% over the three-year period since it was formally opened.

Alternative Update

Brad explained that the project was originally broken down into four segments. This has been reduced to two segments, the West and East Legs.

Charlie Webb showed the at-grade alternative and explained that it won't allow for a Hawley Road ramp to and from the east safely without removing graves. He explained that a new option is being presented for a half interchange.

Charlie introduced the new east leg changes, which includes moving the interstate about 500 feet south of the existing alignment. He explained that this would improve the sight line and allow room for ramps to tie in to 27th Street, but the downside would be more businesses would be impacted than would be with the on-alignment alternative.

He then showed the on-alignment alternative which would be pulled slightly south (50 feet) which improves sight distance slightly but impacts fewer properties. The ramps would be longer and safer than they are currently.

He said that the only two changes since the last meeting are consideration of the half interchange at Hawley and reintroduction of the nearly "on-alignment" alternative.

Charlie introduced the Story Hill neighborhood and explained that there is concern for how the double deck would impact the area. He showed that the lanes would still be higher around Story Hill. To demonstrate what the freeway would look like, he showed an exhibit showing a cross-section of the freeway in comparison to the neighborhood.

The next slide showed a three-dimensional view of the Stadium Interchange. Charlie showed how traffic would flow, and stressed that there would be no left-hand ramps.

Project costs by category for the 8 lane at grade alternative were explained next using a pie chart graphic. Brad said that 35% of the cost (\$300 million) is for pavement and bridge replacement. 53% (\$465 million) is for the geometric improvement. 12% (\$100 million) is the cost of adding the fourth mainline lane in each direction.

For the double deck alternative, 62% (\$685 million) is for geometric improvement. 27% (\$300 million) is for pavement and bridge replacement. 11% (\$120 million) is for the addition of a fourth lane.

• Deb asked what percent would be for stormwater management. Brad responded that it is included in. He said he doesn't know off-hand, but could get her that number.

The next slide demonstrated how Purpose and Need elements are addressed in each segment by comparing the double deck and at-grade alternatives. Brad explained that the 8-lane at-grade partially addresses Purpose and Need.

- Karen Schmiechen asked if the shoulders would be 12 feet wide. Charlie said that the shoulders would not be 12 feet wide through the cemetery on either alternative. Double deck would be 11 feet, but the at-grade would be even less. Karen asked if there is a full 12 foot shoulder along the rest of the corridor. Charlie said it would be everywhere except the cemetery. Karen explained that there wouldn't be room to pull over in an emergency situation. Charlie said the shoulder width could be wider on one side but agreed with Karen.
- Kevin Kaari asked about reversing lanes in AM and PM. Charlie explained that we looked at that and there is a 50/50 directional split between east and west. To make that work efficiently one would need a 70/30 directional split.

Brad then showed a slide discussing the timeline of the alternatives throughout the project. Brad reinforced that the half-diamond interchange is fairly new and needs to be studied at length because of geometric constraints but that it had been created due to the public concerns about eliminating Hawley Road access.

• Chris Hiebert suggested that FHWA most likely wouldn't approve a half-interchange. Bethaney responded that because of the unique challenges on this project and that

there wouldn't be large environmental impacts, the FHWA has not ruled out the partial interchange.

• Len Roecker asked if the 8 lane at-grade would be approved with no shoulders. Charlie said we don't know if the exception would be approved.

Brad stressed that a preferred alternative has not been chosen at this time. He noted there are clear pros and cons of both alternatives, some more significant than others including cost and safety.

- Travis Willer asked about the Hawley half interchange and what the diversion impacts would be. Brad said we are quantifying those numbers.
- Karen asked about cross sections for Story Hill. She said the newsletter referred to all up, partially down, and at-grade. She asked what the cross section refers to. Charlie said all up is being depicted. She asked what partially down would look like. Charlie said it would be four or five feet lower. She said it would be more expensive, but would reduce impacts. Charlie explained that there are two options still on the table for the double deck alternative. The all down option would be an additional \$200 million plus a full closure for a six to nine month time period.
- Pete Daniels asked about the ATC corridor and if it would be cheaper to move them and
 utilize the corridor for traffic. Christine explained that the cemetery is part of that issue
 and that wires couldn't be put over the graves (would need an easement from each
 grave). Charlie said that it was not an option and had already been studied. Brad
 explained that traffic diversion is an adverse effect being addressed as well.
- Ghassan asked if WisDOT is putting the burden upon FHWA to make the decision about one alternative because it has so many concerns associated with it. Bethaney said that all of the considerations were being weighed carefully on this matter.

Section 106 Process

Charlie presented the environmental and historical ramifications of the project. He said that the historical impacts have been a significant part of this study. He showed the cemeteries and explained that Wood National Cemetery and the buildings are (NHL) National Historic Landmarks, which are protected at a national and state level. He then explained that the double deck would have adverse effects on the cemetery. Calvary and Story Hill are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historical Places. He said that legally the groups affected by the impacts need to be consulted with. The team has been meeting with these groups for months discussing the impacts. He said that, so far, it has been determined that the 8-lane at-grade would not create an adverse effect, but that the double deck would. Mitigation is being discussed at this time. He noted that the process is called Section 106.

Public Information

Beth Foy said that the newsletters and ads for the public information meetings have been placed in various places. She said that the meetings are taking place at Marquette University High School and Pettit Center. She mentioned that CAC and Elected Officials meetings were

taking place today and that team members will also be at State Fair in the expo center, which averages about 200 people an hour in foot traffic. Beth explained that physical models will be available after State Fair. She said if anyone wanted the team to speak at local meetings to please request this, but that the models are very large and may not fit in every venue. She noted that they will also be available to view at the hearing.

She said that a suggestion was made at the CAC to create more cross sections and that the group was going to address this suggestion before the PIM.

Brad ended the formal part of the meeting at 11:00 AM and invited the group to view exhibits and ask questions.





Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
	Aleiow	Aziz	Milw. County DOT	aziz.aleiow@milwcnty.com	
2044	Bever	John	WE Energies	john.bever@we-energies.com	414-659-3258
Brin Block	Black	Brian	ATC	bblack@atclic.com	262-506-6907
Ufulilase	Brockman	Mike	Miller Park	mbrockman@thesigmagroup.com	414-588-7931
FIJ-8	Brumfield	LaTroy	WE Energies	LaTroy.Brumfield@we-energies.com	
7300	Colome	Brian	WE Energies	Brian.Colmone@we-energies.com	414-540-5871
la Dail	Daniels	Pete	City of West Allis	pdaniels@westalliswi.gov	414-302-8374
Lije Wil	Dranzik	Brian	Milw. County DOT	Brian.Dranzik@milwaukeecountywi.gov	414-278-4952
1/2/	Hiebert	Chris	SEWRPC	chiebert@sewrpc.org	262-547-6721
	Holtz	Peter	ATC	pholtz@atcllc.com	262-506-6874
Deson	Jensen	Debra	MMSD	djensen@mmsd.com	414-225-2143
Herri Hagii	Kaari	Kevin	WE Energies	Kevin.Kaari@we-energies.com	262-470-531
	Korban	Ghassan	City of Milwaukee	gkorba@milwaukee.gov	





Attended Meeting	- Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
May 1. 1/2/	Maierle	Michael	City of Milwaukee - DCD	michael.maierle@milwaukee.gov	414-286-5720
C/f Ale	Polenske	Jeff	City of Milwaukee	jeffrev.polenske@milwaukee.gov	414-286-2400
Bill Pat	Porter	Bill	City of Wautosa	bporter@wauwatosa.net	414-479-
Of Raus	Rawson	Christine	ATC	crawson@atcllc.com	262-832-8732
Jon Jacken	Roecker	Len	West Milwaukee Village	len.roecker@rasmithnational.com	262-317-3383
//h-	Sande	Dan	We Energies	dan.sande@we-energies.com	414-221-4578
i'	Stibal	John	City of West Allis	jstibal@westalliswi.gov	414-302-8462
	Yunker	Ken	SEWRPC	kyunker@sewrpc.org	
MCT	Thompson	Mile	DNR		
Chris & Found	Forna)	Chris	City of Milw	c formad milwaukae.gov	414-
affect of					
JEFF BAUER	BANER	JEFF	CHZM HILL	Jeff. Barre CHZM. con	262 388-2878
6	X Dupon	Brian	WIS DOT		






Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
Willianders	Anderson	Will	WisDOT	william.anderson@dot.wi.gov	
3113	Bacher- Gresock	Bethaney	FHWA	bethaney.bacher-gresock@dot.gov	
	Beuthling	Rob -	нитв	rbeuthling@hntb.com	
	Bliesner	Brian	WisDOT	brian.bliesner@dot.wi.gov	
	Cox	Carrie	WisDOT	carrie.cox@dot.wi.gov	
15	Dole	Keegan	WisDOT	keegan.dole@dot.wi.gov	
Kuf Farenhal	Farrenkopf	Kurt	Kapur	kfarrenkopf@kapur-assoc.com	
70	Foy	Beth	Beth Foy	bethfoy@execpc.com	
F. S. 3.	Gates	Dylan	WisDOT	dylan.gates@dot.wi.gov	
	Goldsworthy	Ben	CH2M Hill	benjamin.goldsworthy@ch2m.com	
	Harris	Jim		Jim.harris@dot.wi.gov	
Ostel	Heimlich	Brad	CH2M Hill	brad.heimlich@ch2m.com	
Than Land	Kaurich	Tracy	CH2M Hill	tracy.kaurich@dot.wi.gov	





Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
	Lee	Scott	WisDOT	scott.lee@dot.wi.gov	
	Matson	Kathleen	нитв	kmatson@hntb.com	
LM1	McKinney	Sean	WisDOT	sean.mckinney@dot.wi.gov	
DSP	Payant	Dobra	WisDOT	dobra.payant@dot.wi.gov	
	Peterson	Claudia	WisDOT	claudia.peterson@dot.wi.gov	
	Pyritz	Mike	WisDOT	michael.pyritz@dot.wi.gov	
about .	Rohde	Andy	WisDOT	andrew.rohde@dot.wi.gov	
700	Sarnecki	Jennifer	WisDOT	jennifer.sarnecki@dot.wi.gov	
Toren Showsher	Schmiechen	Karen	WisDOT	karen.schmiechen@dot.wi.gov	
	Seboe	Carolyn	нитв	cseboe@hntb.com	
	Smith	Cameron	WisDOT	cameron.smith@dot.wi.gov	
Jul for	Treazise	Mike	WisDOT	michael.treazise@dot.wi.gov	
- 3 rule	Waldschmidt	Jay	WisDOT	jay.waldschmidt@dot.wi.gov	





Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
	Wallace	Brett	WisDOT	brett.wallace@dot.wi.gov	
	Webb	Charlie	CH2M Hill	cwebb1@ch2m.com	
(G)	Willer	Travis	WisDOT	travis.willer@dot.wi.gov	
Tiget	BRUMFIELD	tarkey	WE-ENERGIES	Cathof BRUMFIELDERUSE-ENERGE	·ton
	Photopers.				
Chosen 16h	KORBAN	GHASTAN	city & Milw	Skorba @ milwanka. gov	
Sudan 1. Pman	Tillman	Andy	MCTS	atilman emers. or 6	
1					
20.					
					Of .

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #7

November 19, 2014

Attendees: See sign-in sheets.

Introductions

Jason called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM. He invited the group to pick up a newsletter before leaving, introduced himself to the group, and asked for participants to introduce themselves. He also said that participants are welcome to view the models located in Michigan conference room. The Power Point presentation followed:

Purpose and Need

- Deteriorated pavement updates needed regardless of design
- Heavy congestion need for four lanes
- Unsafe conditions higher accident rate than other comparable freeways
- A freeway that works with local streets

I – 94 is a Federal interstate with Midwest, statewide, and local importance. The City of Milwaukee is the premier destination and hub of commerce for Wisconsin. 32% of the jobs, 26% of the population and 41% of businesses are within a five-mile radius of the Stadium Interchange.

Public Hearing

- December 3 and 4, 2014
- Dual format hearing
- Opportunities for public and private testimony
- Extended 60 day comment period (normally 45 days)
- Written testimony received into Public Hearing record through January 13, 2015.

Public Input

Common comments received from those who live within a few miles of the corridor (PIMs, neighborhood meetings, correspondence) emphasized the interstate's need to:

- Improve safety
- Maintain access points
- Minimize impact to surrounding areas

Those who live outside the corridor (State Fair, online survey, correspondence) emphasized the interstate's need to:

- Improve safety
- Maintain access points
- Increase capacity, decrease delays

Post-hearing

- January 13, 2015 60-day comment period ends for public hearing but comments will go into record.
- After comment period, WisDOT will evaluate input
- WisDOT identifies preferred alternative
- Section 106 process continues with consulting parties to identify and codify mitigation
- Final EIS is prepared and sent to FHWA
- FHWA will issue a Record of Decision in summer of 2015

Based on the current schedule, construction is anticipated to start in 2019 (subject to funding availability and legislative approvals).

Section 106 update

WisDOT and FHWA have met regularly and consulted with parties that have an interest in historic properties that may be affected by the project such as:

- Calvary cemetery
- Northwestern Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers National Historic Landmark (NHL) and Historic District (includes Wood National Cemetery)
- Soldiers' Home Reef National Historic Landmark
- Story Hill Residential Historic Districts 1, 2 and 3

The group has determined that the At-grade alternative would have No Adverse Effect on the historic properties. The Double-deck alternative would have an Adverse Effect on the Soldiers' Home NHL and Historic District and Calvary Cemetery, and a potential Adverse Effect on Story Hill Residential Historic District 2 and 3.

Alternative Review

Charlie reviewed the alternatives still being considered. He explained the cost differences and features of each alternative.

Chris asked why there would be collector/distributor (CD) roads with the full interchange, but not with the half interchange. Tom explained that there isn't enough room with the At-grade alternative for CD roads in both directions. He explained that neither follow federal guidelines but after working with the team and central office the current alternatives demonstrate the best layouts. Tom said that including the CD road was determined to be the safest and most

efficient plan for the Double-deck alternative and the auxiliary lanes the safest and most efficient for the At-grade alternative.

Mike Duckett asked if removing the Hawley Road access from the Double-deck alternative would lower the cost significantly and eliminate the need for the CD road. Tom said that removing the Hawley Road interchange would reduce the cost of the Double-deck alternative by \$60-65 million. Brad explained that public feedback has expressed keeping access as a priority, and full range-of-motion preferred over a partial interchange.

Christine asked about 44th Street and why the local interchange under the Stadium Interchange is shown differently on the alternatives exhibits (one exhibit shows 44th Street and a new "46th Street" connecting with the freeway on/off ramps, the other exhibit shows 44th Street and Yount Drive connecting to the freeway ramps). Charlie said either are feasible, and this will be reviewed after the alternative is chosen. Charlie said both options were shown to demonstrate how they work, but they aren't specific or exclusive to either of the interchange and freeway design options.

Mike Thompson asked if the double-deck alternative had been decided as all-up or partial down. Charlie said it could still be partially down (up to a maximum of 8 feet below the existing freeway's elevation), but not 'all down' because construction would require complete freeway closure in addition to being cost prohibitive. The decision has been made to be all-up or partial down. Mike asked if drainage was impacted by partial down or if it would create a sag in the freeway. Charlie said it would be like a tunnel with ventilation and emergency exit procedures in place. There would have to be drainage for spills, etc. with that alternative. Jason said the team has been cognizant of stormwater management throughout the study, and is aware of the challenges. Jay said that the Section 106 historic preservation process is looking at the partial down as well.

Dan Sande expressed concern about the overhead electric lines on the East end of the freeway and wondered if WisDOT had figured out where electric lines will go. Jason said WisDOT has been coordinating with WE Energies and will continue to work together to find an appropriate location for relocated overhead power lines.

Pete Daniels asked about a incorporating a Texas U-turn. Charlie said that it had been looked at on previous projects and has received strong opposition from the public. He said there are already ramps at 68th Street which will remain in place under bother west segment alternatives (at grade and double deck). He said if people that want to go downtown from Hawley Road had to travel west on a frontage road all the way back to 68th Street, nothing is being accomplished; they could simply enter the freeway at the proposed 68th Street interchange ramp. Jason noted that the team has tried to minimize the freeway footprint, and adding a Texas U-turn would widen the footprint.

Brian reminded everyone to attend the Public Hearing. Jason thanked everyone for coming and invited them to stay and ask questions.



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #7




I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Wednesday; November 19, 2014

Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
	Aleiow	Aziz	Milw. County DOT	aziz.aleiow@milwcnty.com	
	Bever	John	WE Energies	john,bever@we-energies.com	414-659-3258
Brido Huck	Black	Brian	ATC	bblack@atcilc.com	262-506-6907
i P	Brockman	Mike	Miller Park	mbrockman@thesigmagroup.com	
la Davil	Daniels	Pete	City of West Allis	pdaniels@westalliswi.gov	414-302-8374
X	Dranzik	Brian	Milw. County DOT	Brian Dranzik@milwaukeecountywi.gov	414-278-4952
X White with	Duckett	Mike	Miller Park	mduckett@millerparkdistrict.com	414-940-2139
(Che Formal	Fornal	Chris	City of Milwaukee	chris.fornal@milwaukee.gov	414-286-2452
affect	Hiebert	Chris	SEWRPC	chiebert@sewrpc.org	262-547-6721
1 Pite HOZ	Holtz	Peter	ATC	pholtz@atcilc.com	262-506-6874
	Jensen	Debra	MMSD	djensen@mmsd.com	414-225-2143
Ferri Faari	Kaari	Kevin	WE Energies	Kevin Kaari@we-energies.com	414-221-23



ATTENDANCE RECORD





Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
Steven Lesak	Sandy	Kellner	MCTS	mmacarthur @ mcTs. org Sleselk @ mcTs. org skellner@mcts.org	343-7264 343-729 414-937-3205
	Korban	Ghassan	City of Milwaukee	gkorba@milwaukee.gov	
11/1/1/4	Maierle	Michael	City of Milwaukee - DCD	michael.maierle@milwaukee.gov	414-286-5720
7	Polenske	Jeff	City of Milwaukee	jeffrey.polenske@milwaukee.gov	414-286-2400
4	Porter	Bill	City of Wautosa	bporter@wauwatosa.net	
alkowsn	Rawson	Christine	ATC	crawson@atclic.com	262-832-8732
Jen Berlin	Roecker	Len	West Milwaukee Village	Jen.roecker@rasmithnational.com	262-317-3383
1/4-	Sande	Dan	We Energies	dan.sande@we-energies.com	414-221-4578
John Stiby	Stibal	John	City of West Allis	jstibal@westalliswi.gov	414-302-8462
Micingly un	Thompson	Mike	WDNR	michael.thompson@dnr.state.wi.us	414 303 348
	Yunker	Ken	SEWRPC	kyunker@sewrpc.org	
Taxwell	walled	+ Jay	winDot	is my with about Children, you	68-287-980



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #7 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Wednesday; November 19, 2014



Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
phone	Bacher- Gresock	Bethaney	FHWA	bethaney.bacher-gresock@dot.gov	
X	Bauer	Jeff	CH2M Hill	jeff.bauer@ch2m.com	
\bigcirc	Beuthling	Rob	HNTB	rbeuthling@hntb.com	
XVan Bhin	Bliesner	Brian	WisDOT	brian.bliesner@dot.wi.gov	
	Dole	Keegan	WisDOT	keegan.dole@dot.wi.gov	
X	Farrenkopf	Kurt	Kapur	kfarrenkopf@kapur-assoc.com	
	Foy	Beth	Beth Foy	bethfoy@execpc.com	
	Gates	Dylan	WisDOT	dylan_gates@dot.wi.gov	
1.7	Goldsworthy	Ben	CH2M Hill	benjamin.goldsworthy@ch2m.com	
Try Kent	Kaurich	Tracy	CH2M Hill	tracy.kaurich@dot.wi.gov	
	Matson	Kathleen	нитв	kmatson@hntb.com	
	McKinney	Sean	WisDOT	sean.mckinney@dot.wi.gov	



ATTENDANCE RECORD Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #7 I-94 East-West Freeway Corridor Study Wednesday; November 19, 2014



Attended Meeting	Last name	First name	Organization	e-mail	Phone
×	Pettit	Tom	CH2M Hill	tom.pettit@ch2m.com	
	Pyritz	Mike	WisDOT	michael.pyritz@dot.wi.gov	
	Smith	Cameron	WisDOT	cameron.smith@dot.wi.gov	
X	Treazise	Mike	WisDOT	michael.treazise@dot.wi.gov	
X	Waldschmidt	Jay	WisDOT	jay.waldschmidt@dot.wi.gov	
X	Webb	Charlie	CH2M Hill	cwebb1@ch2m.com	
Sim Stenzel	Stenze	Jim	west Mila	James, Stenzell wastimilworker	, evra
Jose Ty	Lynch	Jason	WISDOT	jason lynch @dot wi gov	,
BRCalina	Colmane	Brion	WE	brian colmant @ worning is com	414
Milet	BRUMFIELD	LANKOY	WE-ENEROIS	W47225 2 WE-BULLAGES. COM	414